

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/652,878	08/31/2000	Theodore M. Taylor	4372US (99-1187)	3858
24247 7	590 12/02/2005		EXAMINER	
TRASK BRITT P.O. BOX 2550 SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84110			ELEY, TIMOTHY V	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
0.12.1 2.1112	3111, 01 01110		3724	

DATE MAILED: 12/02/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	~
Ŋ	o

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.		Applicant(s)	<u> </u>
	09/652,878	TAYLOR, THEODORE M.	
Ì	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Timothy V. Eley	3724	

	Timothy V. Eley	3724					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress				
THE REPLY FILED 14 November 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.							
The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:							
a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date	e of the final rejection.						
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 7	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE 06.07(f).	g date of the final rejecti FIRST REPLY WAS F	on. ILED WITHIN				
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).							
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exte a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed 	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of th	ns of the date of e appeal. Since				
AMENDMENTS							
 The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below); (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below); (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for 							
appeal; and/or	,,	gp,g					
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a		ected claims.					
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).							
 Interpretation of the strength o							
non-allowable claim(s). 7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		ll be entered and an e	explanation of				
Claim(s) allowed: <u>1,2,6,11-16,40-52 and 55-71</u> . Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: <u>72-74</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: <u>51, but will be rejected</u> .	oined since 49 is allowed.						
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE							
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 	d sufficient reasons why the affidav	it or other evidence is	necessary and				
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to of showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar	overcome all rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fai	Is to provide a				
 The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanatio REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER 	10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.						
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered bu	ut does NOT place the application in	n condition for allowar	nce because:				
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). 13. ☑ Other: See Continuation Sheet.	(PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper N	Timothy V. Ele Primary Examir					
			,				

Continuation of 13. Other: Applicant argues that the top plate 46 of the platen 40 could not be considered to be a subpad of the type recited in independent claim 74, as Crevasse lacks any express or inherent description that a negative pressure may be applied to a bottom surface of the top plate 46 to retain the same on the remainder of the platen 40. Moreover, even assuming, arguendo, that the top plate 46 of the platen 40 of Crevasse could serve as a subpad, Crevasse lacks any express or inherent description that the top plate 46 is removable from the remainder of the platen 40, or that the remainder of the platen 40 is configured to "removably retain" the top plate 46. Instead, it is apparent from the description provided at col. 4, lines 4-15 of Crevasse that the top plate 46 is pennanently fixed to the platen 40, and may not be removed therefrom.

However, it should be noted that some of the suction(or negative pressure) applied to the channel 48 will be applied to a that portion of the plate 46 between the openings 41-45, and this suction will aid in retaining the plate on the remainder of platen 40. Also, it should be noted that applicant does not recite that the subpad is "removably" retained.

Applicant argues that FIG. 5 of Nishi quite clearly illustrates, the peripheral edges of both the base member 2 and the polishing cloth 3 remain exposed when the channel groove 7 of the base member 2 is engaged by the protrusion 4a from the surface of the turntable 4. surdoes not expressly or inherently describe that the polishing cloth 3 thereof moves independently relative to the base member 2 of the cloth cartridge 1 thereof. Thus, the protrusion of Nishi does not comprise a "lip" that "substantially completely surround[s] a peripheral edge of a subpad," as would be required to anticipate each and every element of independent claim 72.

However, the lip 4a does completely surround "a peripheral edge" of the subpad 2. Furthermore, applicant does not positively recite the polishing pad in combination with the subpad support, and therefore, the apparatus of Nishi et al could be used with a polishing pad 3 which is movable independently from the subpad 2.